



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,457	01/11/2002	John David Russell	50277-1732	8504
42425	7590	07/17/2006		
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089				
			EXAMINER PITARRO, RYAN F	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/044,457

Applicant(s)

RUSSELL, JOHN DAVID

Examiner

Ryan F. Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-26 have been examined.

***Response to Amendment***

2. This communication is in response to Amendment C filed 4/18/2006. Claims 1, 11, 14, and 24 are independent claims. This action is Final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 5-6, 8-14, 18-19, 21-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meek ("Meek", US 6,111,574).

As per independent claim 1, Meek discloses a computer implemented method of depicting a plurality of items and how said plurality of items satisfy multiple criteria, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of: displaying in a particular order a list of visual indicators (Column 4 lines 59 – Column 5 line 1, Column 7 lines 21-56), wherein the particular order indicates how a plurality of items satisfy a first criteria (Column 4 lines 59 – Column 5 line 1, Column 7 lines 21-56); detecting input indicating the selection of a second criteria (Column 5 lines 1-27); in response to detecting said

input, determining how said plurality of items satisfy the second criteria; and while retaining said particular order, displaying a visual indication of how said plurality of items satisfy the second criteria (Figure 5).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Meek discloses a method wherein the step of displaying a visual indication includes displaying one or more other visual indicators visually associated with a subset of items that satisfy said second criteria (Figure 5).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Meek discloses a method wherein the step of displaying a visual indication includes altering the visual appearance of one or more visual indicators from said list of visual indicators (Column 5 lines 49-64).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Meek discloses a method wherein the step of detecting input indicating the selection of a second criteria includes detecting input selecting a particular category of a plurality of categories (Column 5 lines 1-27); and the step of displaying a visual indication of how said plurality of items satisfy a second criteria includes displaying a visual indication of which items of said plurality of items belong to said particular category (Column 5 lines 1-27).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Meek discloses a method wherein said step of detecting input selecting a particular category includes detecting that a user has selected said particular category as a selection in a list box listing said plurality of categories as selections (Column 5 lines 1-27).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Meek discloses a method detecting input indicating the selection of a third criteria (Column 5 lines 28-48); and

while retaining said particular order, displaying a visual indication of how said plurality of items satisfy said third criteria, wherein said third criteria is different from said second criteria (Column 5 lines 28-48, Figure 5 ).

As per independent claim 11, Meek discloses a method of generating a page this causes a browser to depict a plurality of items and how said plurality of items satisfy multiple criteria, the method comprising the steps of: generating first page elements that cause said browser to display in a particular order a list of visual indicators, wherein the particular order indicates how said plurality of items satisfy a first criteria (Column 4 lines 59 – Column 5 line 1, Column 7 lines 21-56); generating one or more second page elements that enable the browser to receive user input indicating a selection of one or more criteria of a plurality of criteria (Column 5 lines 1-27) ; and generating third page elements that cause the browser to display, for each particular criterion of a plurality of criteria, a visual indication of how said plurality of items satisfy said particular criterion, without changing said particular order, in response to receiving user input indicating a selection of said particular criterion (Column 5 lines 1-48, Figure 5).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Meek discloses the steps further include issuing a query to a database system that stores information about said plurality of items, wherein said query requests data that may be used to determine which set of items of said plurality of items satisfy a first criterion of said plurality of criteria; receiving results of the query from the database system; and wherein the step of generating third page elements is based on an examination of the results (Column 5 line 49 - Column 6 line 24).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Meek discloses a method including performing an examination of contents of said plurality of items to determine which of said plurality of elements satisfy a particular criteria of said plurality of criteria wherein the step of generating third page elements is based on said examination of the contents (Column 5 lines 49 – Column 6 lines 24).

Claim 14 is similar in scope to that of claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to that of claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to that of claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to that of claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to that of claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to that of claim 10, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is similar in scope to that of claim 11, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is similar in scope to that of claim 12, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to that of claim 13, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4,7,15-17,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meek ("Meek", US 6,111,574) in view of Gorman ("Gorman", US 6,738,770).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Meek fails to disclose a self-contained page. However, Gorman discloses a method wherein the steps further include a browser receiving a self-contained page (Figure 4a); and wherein the steps are performed by said browser in response to executing said self-contained page, without said browser having to interact over a network with a server to determine how said plurality of items satisfy said second condition (Figure 4a). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Meek with the teaching of Gorman. Motivation to do so would have been to successfully filter multiple columns of data grids.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Meek-Gorman discloses a method wherein the step of the browser receiving the self-contained page includes the browser receiving the self-contained page over the network from the server (Gorman, Column 4 lines 39-54).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Meek-Gorman discloses a method wherein the step of the browser receiving the self-contained page includes said browser causing said self-contained page to be read from removable computer-media (Gorman, *Column 4 lines 3-39*).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, EAST discloses a method wherein said first criteria is based on an alphabetic order of names associated with said plurality of items, and the particular order of the list of visual indicators indicates the alphabetic order of the name of the items (Gorman, Figure 4c, Column 5 lines 41-55);

Claim 15 is similar in scope to that of claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to that of claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to that of claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to that of claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.



### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 18 April 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued that displaying in a particular order a list of visual indicators, wherein the particular order indicates how a plurality of times satisfy a first criteria is not taught by Meek and that nothing in Meek suggests this. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. In fact, the system of Meek allows a user to define and display tags along with a query to indicate satisfaction of a certain criteria. These tags are subsequently displayed with an item to show the relevance of the items in a particular order. The Examiner also further points out Column 7 lines 21-56 for clarification purposes.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro  
Art Unit 2174  
Patent Examiner

RFP

  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100